



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,676	04/16/2004	Masaya Endo	008312-0309255	8662

909 7590 04/06/2007  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

CHOW, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/825,676

Applicant(s)

ENDO, MASAYA

Examiner

Jeffrey J. Chow

Art Unit

2628

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

The election with traverse has been made over the telephone. The Examiner has withdrawn the restriction.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 9 – 11 are directed towards nonfunctional descriptive material. A computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is patent eligible subject matter if it is a computer element, which defines structure and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer, which permits the functionality to be realized. The claims are directed to descriptive material and hence nonstatutory.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2628

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 3, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arai et al. (US 2003/0227423).

Regarding independent claim 1, Arai discloses a second display space 5b displayed on a second sub display apparatus 8 (Figure 7A), then the second display space 5b is displayed on a main display apparatus 6 (paragraphs 45 and 62 and Figures 4, 7A, and 7B), which reads on the claimed means for, when a display screen controlled under the multi-monitor environment is moved from a first display monitor to a second display monitor. Arai discloses when the active window is interchanged, that window can be displayed on the front screen of the main display apparatus (paragraph 57) and Arai discloses the usage of active windows (paragraphs 54 – 57), which reads on the claimed display screen on which a window is displayed and the claimed acquiring window display information on the display screen of the first display monitor as information which can be reproduced on the second display monitor and the claimed means for holding the window display information.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Arai discloses taking the center coordinates of the window within a working space having the maximum surface area (paragraph 55), which reads on the claimed at least size and position information of all windows displayed on the display screen of the first display monitor. Arai discloses the display resolution of the main display apparatus unit and the two sub display apparatuses (paragraph 66), which reads on the claimed display resolution of the first display monitor and the claimed display resolution of the second display monitor.

Regarding independent claim 3, Arai discloses a first display space 5a displayed on a main display apparatus 6 (Figure 7A), then the first display space 5a is displayed on a first sub display apparatus 8 (paragraphs 45 and 62 and Figures 4, 7A, and 7B), which reads on the claimed means for, when a display screen controlled under the multi-monitor environment is moved from a first display monitor to a first display monitor. Arai discloses the display resolution of the main display apparatus unit and the two sub display apparatuses (paragraph 66), which reads on the claimed acquiring at least the sizes of the display screen of the first and second display monitors, which are controlled under control of the means for controlling the plurality of display monitors, as a number of dots. Arai discloses when the active window is interchanged, that window can be displayed on the front screen of the main display apparatus (paragraph 57) and Arai discloses the usage of active windows (paragraphs 54 – 57) and the SXGA display space is downscaled to the XGA (paragraph 67), which reads on the claimed display screen on which a window is displayed and the claimed means for changing the sizes of all windows on the screen of the first display monitor in proportion to the size of the screen acquired by the means for acquiring the size, wherein the second display monitor displays all windows changed by the means for changing the sizes.

Regarding independent claims 6 and 9, claims 6 and 9 are similar in scope as to claim 3, thus the rejection for claim 3 hereinabove is applicable to claims 6 and 9.

Claims 4, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hatori et al. (US 2003/0076340).

Regarding independent claim 4, Hatori discloses a desktop 10 with a set resolution (ie. 1024x768; 800x600) (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed a display monitor and the claimed means for changing a resolution of the display monitor and the claimed means for acquiring a size of the screen of the display monitor as a number of dots when the means for changing the resolution changes the resolution of the display monitor. Hatori discloses acquiring position and size of all windows S101, then calculating position and size of windows after changing the display resolution S102 and S103, and displaying windows S106 for all windows S107 (Figure 2) and the windows are the same proportion as the screen when the resolution is changed (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for changing the size of all windows displayed on the display monitor in proportion to the size of the screen acquired by the means for acquiring the size and the claimed means for displaying all of the windows, which is changed by the means for changing the sizes, on the display monitor. Arai discloses a multi-monitor environment

Regarding independent claim 7, claim 7 is similar in scope as to claim 4, thus the rejection for claim 4 hereinabove is applicable to claim 7.

Regarding independent claim 5, Hatori discloses a desktop 10 with a set resolution (ie. 1024x768; 800x600) and windows W in the desktop 10 (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for displaying a second window displayed in a first window. Hatori discloses acquiring position and size of all windows S101 and the resolution if the display S102 (Figure 2) and the calculating the position and size of unchanged windows, and the ratio of display resolutions before and after changing (paragraph 51), which reads on the claimed means for, when a size of the first window is changed while the second window displayed in the first window, calculating a ratio of the changed window size. Hatori discloses the windows are the same proportion as the

Art Unit: 2628

desktop when the resolution is changed (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for changing the size of the second window displayed in the first window at the rate calculated by the means for calculating the ratio and displaying the second window.

Regarding independent claim 8, claim 8 is similar in scope as to claim 5, thus the rejection for claim 5 hereinabove is applicable to claim 8.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatori et al. (US 2003/0076340) in view of Arai et al. (US 2003/0227423).

Regarding independent claim 10, Hatori discloses a desktop 10 with a set resolution (ie. 1024x768; 800x600) (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed a display monitor and the claimed means for changing a resolution of the display monitor and the claimed means for acquiring a size of the screen of the display monitor as a number of dots when the means for changing the resolution changes the resolution of the display monitor. Hatori discloses acquiring position and size of all windows S101, then calculating position and size of windows after changing the display resolution S102 and S103, and displaying windows S106 for all windows S107 (Figure 2) and the windows are the same proportion as the screen when the resolution is changed (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for changing the size of all windows displayed on

Art Unit: 2628

the display monitor in proportion to the size of the screen acquired by the means for acquiring the size and the claimed means for displaying all of the windows, which is changed by the means for changing the sizes, on the display monitor. Hatori did not expressly disclose a multi-monitor environment. Arai disclose a multi-monitor environment (Figure 5). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hatori's system to be able to change a resolution on a monitor and adjust windows displayed on the screen in a multi-monitor environment. One would be motivated to do so because this allows users to view more information on more than one monitor.

Regarding independent claim 11, Hatori discloses a desktop 10 with a set resolution (ie. 1024x768; 800x600) and windows W in the desktop 10 (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for displaying a second window displayed in a first window. Hatori discloses acquiring position and size of all windows S101 and the resolution if the display S102 (Figure 2) and the calculating the position and size of unchanged windows, and the ratio of display resolutions before and after changing (paragraph 51), which reads on the claimed means for, when a size of the first window is changed while the second window displayed in the first window, calculating a ratio of the changed window size. Hatori discloses the windows are the same proportion as the desktop when the resolution is changed (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed means for changing the size of the second window displayed in the first window at the rate calculated by the means for calculating the ratio and displaying the second window. Hatori did not expressly disclose a multi-monitor environment. Arai disclose a multi-monitor environment (Figure 5). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hatori's system to be able to change a adjust the sizes of windows in a window (desktop)



Art Unit: 2628

displayed on the screen in a multi-monitor environment. One would be motivated to do so because this allows users to view more information on more than one monitor.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Chow whose telephone number is (571)-272-8078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00AM - 5:00PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571)-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJC



ULKA CHAUHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER